

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,907	SEIVER, JOHN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hal I. Kaplan	2836	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hal I. Kaplan. (3) Kameron D. Kelly.
 (2) Michael Sherry. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 05 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent Application of Pan (2004/0158772).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Pan reference was discussed. Rejection as written does not include transformers as part of generators, and the bus of Pan is not at the same voltage as the generators unless the transformers are considered part of the generators. Applicant considers the term "all" in claim 1 to mean that all loads are connected to the bus simultaneously (no load shedding). The claim does not recite that there is no load shedding. The most important issue is that the total power consumed by the loads is greater than the rating of the bus.